Reuben Yeroushalmi (SBN 193981) 1 Daniel D. Cho (SBN 105409) Ben Yeroushalmi (SBN 232540) ENDORSED YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES FILED San Francisco County Superior Court 3 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 240W Beverly Hills, California 90212 4 JUN 1 3-2014 310.623.1926 Telephone: Facsimile: 310.623.1930 5 CLERK OF THE COURT LESLEY FISCELLA Attorneys for Plaintiff. 6 Deputy Clerk Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 10 11 CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC., CASE NO. CGC-12-523788 12 in the public interest, Reservation#: 030404-17 13 CONSENT JUDGMENT (PROPOSED) Plaintiff. 14 Room: 610 15 Judge: Hon. Cynthia M. Lee Filed: August 28, 2012 THOMAS & BETTS CORPORATION, a 16 Tennessee Corporation; THOMAS & BETTS INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware 17 Corporation; TRUE VALUE COMPANY, a 18 Delaware Corporation; and DOES 1-20; 19 Defendants. 20 1. INTRODUCTION 21 22 This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between plaintiff Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. ("CAG") acting on behalf of itself and in the interest of the public and 24 defendants THOMAS & BETTS CORPORATION ("TBC"), THOMAS & BETTS 25 INTERNATIONAL, INC. ("TBI"), and TRUE VALUE COMPANY ("TVC") (all defendants 26 collectively referred to as "DEFENDANTS"), with each a Party and collectively referred to as 27 "Parties." 28 CONSENT JUDGMENT TPROPOSED

DEFENDANTS employ ten or more persons, is a person in the course of doing business for purposes of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 et seq. ("Proposition 65"), and manufactures, distributes, and sells Red Dot® Portable Outdoor Flood Light #B660GR ("Lights").

#### 1.3 Notice of Violation.

- 1.3.1 On or about July 25, 2011, CAG served DEFENDANTS and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" (the "July 25, 2011 Notice") that provided the recipients with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) contained in the Lights.
- 1.3.2 No public enforcer has commenced or diffigently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the July 25, 2011 Notice.

### 1.4 Complaint.

On August 28, 2012, CAG filed a Complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint") in San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-12-523788. The Complaint alleges, among other things, that DEFENDANTS violated Proposition 65 by failing to give clear and reasonable warnings of exposure to DEHP from Lights.

### 1.5 Consent to Jurisdiction

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the City and County of San Francisco and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaint and of all claims which were or could have been raised by any person or entity based in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, on the facts alleged therein or arising therefrom or related to.

### 1.6 No Admission

This Consent Judgment resolves claims that are denied and disputed. The parties enter

into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full and final settlement of any and all claims between the parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. This Consent Judgment shall not constitute an admission with respect to any material allegation of the Complaint, each and every allegation of which DEFENDANTS denies, nor may this Consent Judgment or compliance with it be used as evidence of any wrongdoing, misconduct, culpability or liability on the part of DEFENDANTS.

### 2. **DEFINITIONS**

- 2.1 "Covered Products" means Red Dot® Portable Outdoor Flood Light #B660GR, limited to those manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by TBC, TBI and TVC.
- 2.2 "Effective Date" means the date of service of Notice of the Court's approval of this Consent Judgment.

### 3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF/CLEAR AND REASONABLE WARNINGS

3.1 Within sixty (60) days of the date this Consent Judgment is entered by the Court, DEFENDANTS shall not sell or offer for sale in California Covered Products without first providing a "clear and reasonable warning" under Proposition 65 pursuant to 27 Cal. Code Regs. § 25603 with the following language:

"WARNING: This product contains a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and reproductive toxicity."

This warning shall: (a) be displayed on the product's labeling, packaging, shelving, or display; (b) be set out in a text box on a separate line or in a separate paragraph; and (c) be displayed with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, or designs as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual.

### 4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

4.1 Within ten (10) business days of the Effective Date, DEFENDANTS shall pay a total of Fifty-Two Thousand Dollars (\$52,000.00) by separate checks apportioned as set forth below.

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

27

28

26

4.1.1 Civil Penalties, DEFENDANTS shall issue two separate checks for a total amount of two thousand dollars (\$2,000.00) as penalties pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.12: (a) one check made payable to the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) in the amount of \$1,500.00, representing 75% of the total penalty; and (b) one check to Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. in the amount of \$500.00, representing 25% of the total penalty. Two separate 1099s shall be issued for the above payments: The first 1099 shall be issued to OEHHA, P.O. Box 4010, Sacramento, CA 95184 (EIN: 68-0284486) in the amount of \$1,500.00. The second 1099 shall be issued in the amount of \$500.00 to CAG and delivered to: Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 240W, Beverly Hills, California 90212.

4.1.2 Payment In Lieu of Civil Penalties: DEFENDANTS shall pay \$2,000.00 in lieu of civil penalties to "Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc." CAG will use this payment for investigation of the public's exposure to Proposition 65 listed chemicals through various means, laboratory fees for testing for Proposition 65 listed chemicals, expert fees for evaluating exposures through various mediums, including but not limited to consumer product, occupational, and environmental exposures to Proposition 65 listed chemicals, and the cost of hiring consulting and retained experts who assist with the extensive scientific analysis necessary for those files in litigation, as well as administrative costs incurred during the litigation, in order to reduce the public's exposure to Proposition 65 listed chemicals by notifying those persons and/or entities believed to be responsible for such exposures and attempting to persuade those persons and/or entities to reformulate their products or the source of exposure to completely eliminate or lower the level of Proposition 65 listed chemicals, thereby addressing the same public harm as allegedly in the instant Action. Further, should the court require it, CAG will submit under seal, an accounting of these funds as described above as to how the funds were used. The check shall be made payable to "Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc." and delivered to Reuben Yeroushalmi, Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 240W Beverly Hills, California 90212.

 4.1.3 Reimbursement of Attorneys' Fees and Costs: DEFENDANTS shall pay \$48,000.00 to "Yeroushalmi & Associates" as reimbursement for the investigation fees and costs, testing costs, expert fees, attorney fees, and other litigation costs and expenses for all work performed through the approval of this Consent Judgment.

- 4.2 Payments pursuant to 4.1.1, 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 shall be delivered to: Reuben Yeroushalmi, Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 240W, Beverly Hills, CA 90212.
- TBI agree to place \$13,000 in an escrow account ("Escrow Funds"). The Escrow Funds will be used to explore the feasibility of reformulation of the Covered Products. If after one year following entry of this Consent Judgment or when the \$13,000 is exhausted (whichever occurs first), TBC & TBI, in their sole discretion, determines that reformulation is not feasible, "clear and reasonable warning" labels will continue to be utilized on all Covered Products distributed for sale in California.

# MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

behalf of itself and in the public interest and DEFENDANTS and its officers, directors, insurers, employees, parents, shareholders, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, partners, affiliates, sister companies and their successors and assigns ("Defendant Releasees"), including but not limited to each of its suppliers, customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, or any other person in the course of doing business, and the successors and assigns of any of them, who may use, maintain, distribute or sell Covered Products ("Downstream Defendant Releasees"), for all claims for violations of Proposition 65 up through the Effective Date based on exposure to DEHP from Covered Products as set forth in the Notice. DEFENDANTS and Defendant Releasees' with Proposition 65 with respect to DEHP exposures from Covered Products as set forth in the Notice.

28

CAG on behalf of itself, its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, 5.2 successors, and/or assignees, hereby waives all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action and releases all claims, including, without limitation, all actions, and causes of action, in law or in equity, suits, liabilities, demands, obligations, damages, costs, fines, penalties, losses, or expenses (including, but not limited to, investigation fees, expert fees, and attorneys' fees) of any nature whatsoever, whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent (collectively "Claims"), against DEFENDANTS, Defendant Releasees, and Downstream Defendant Releasees arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to DEHP from Covered Products manufactured, distributed, or sold by DEFENDANTS and Defendant Releasees. In furtherance of the foregoing, as to alteged exposures to DEHP from Covered Products, CAG hereby waives any and all rights and benefits which it now has, or in the future may have conferred upon it with respect to the Claims arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to DEHP from Covered Products by virtue of the provisions of section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM, MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

CAG understands and acknowledges that the significance and consequence of this waiver of California Civil Code section 1542 is that even if CAG suffers future damages arising out of or resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the Claims arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to DEHP from Covered Products, including but not limited to any exposure to, or failure to warn with respect to exposure to DEHP from the Covered Products, CAG will not be able to make any claim for those damages against DEFENDANTS or the Defendant Releasees or Downstream Defendant Releasees. Furthermore, CAG acknowledges that it intends

these consequences for any such Claims arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to DEHP from Covered Products as may exist as of the date of this release but which CAG does not know exist, and which, if known, would materially affect their decision to enter into this Consent Judgment, regardless of whether their lack of knowledge is the result of ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause.

### ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT

- 6.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be enforced exclusively by the parties hereto. The parties may, by noticed motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of California, City and County of San Francisco, giving the notice required by law, enforce the terms and conditions contained herein. A Party may enforce any of the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment only after that Party first provides 30 days' notice to the Party allegedly failing to comply with the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment and attempts to resolve such Party's failure to comply in an open and good faith manner.
- 6.2 Notice of Violation. Prior to bringing any motion, order to show cause, or other proceeding to enforce Section 3 of this Consent Judgment, CAG shall provide a Notice of Violation ("NOV") to DEFENDANTS. The NOV shall include for each of the Covered Products: the date(s) the alleged violation(s) was observed and the location at which the Covered Products were offered for sale, and shall be accompanied by all test data obtained by CAG regarding the Covered Products, including an identification of the component(s) of the Covered Products that were tested.
  - 6.2.1 Non-Contested NOV. CAG shall take no further action regarding the alleged violation if, within 30 days of receiving such NOV, DEFENDANTS serves a Notice of Election ("NOE") that meets one of the following conditions:
  - (a) The Covered Products were shipped by DEFENDANTS for sale in California before the Effective Date, or

- (b) Since receiving the NOV DEFENDANTS has taken corrective action by either (i) requesting that its customers in California remove the Covered Products identified in the NOV from sale in California and destroy or return the Covered Products to DEFENDANTS, or (ii) providing a clear and reasonable warning for the Covered Products identified in the NOV pursuant to 27 Cal. Code Regs. § 25603.
- 6.2.2 Contested NOV. DEFENDANTS may serve an NOE informing CAG of its election to contest the NOV within 30 days of receiving the NOV.
- (a) In its election, DEFENDANTS may request that the sample(s) Covered Products tested by CAG be subject to confirmatory testing at an EPA-accredited laboratory.
- (b) If the confirmatory testing establishes that the Covered Products do not contain DEHP, CAG shall take no further action regarding the alleged violation. If the testing does not establish compliance with Proposition 65, DEFENDANTS may withdraw its NOE to contest the violation and may serve a new NOE pursuant to Section 6.2.2.
- (c) If DEFENDANTS does not withdraw an NOE to contest the NOV, the Parties shall meet and confer for a period of no less than 30 days before CAG may seek an order enforcing the terms of this Consent Judgment.
- 6.3 In any proceeding brought by either Party to enforce this Consent Judgment, such party may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties or remedies as may be provided by law for any violation of Proposition 65 or this Consent Judgment.

# ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

7.1 CAG shall file a motion seeking approval of this Consent Judgment pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f). Upon entry of the Consent Judgment, CAG and DEFENDANTS waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations of the Complaint.

and any and all prior agreements between the parties merged herein shall terminate and become null and void, and the actions shall revert to the status that existed prior to the execution date of this Consent Judgment; (b) no term of this Consent Judgment or any draft thereof, or of the negotiation, documentation, or other part or aspect of the Parties' settlement discussions, shall have any effect, nor shall any such matter be admissible in evidence for any purpose in this Action, or in any other proceeding; and (c) the Parties agree to meet and confer to determine whether to modify the terms of the Consent Judgment and to resubmit it for approval.

### 8. MODIFICATION OF JUDGMENT

- 8.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only upon written agreement of the parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or upon motion of any party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court.
- 8.2 Any Party seeking to modify this Consent Judgment shall attempt in good faith to meet and confer with the other Party prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment.

## RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

9.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

# 10. DUTIES LIMITED TO CALIFORNIA

This Consent Judgment shall have no effect on Covered Products sold outside the State of California.

# 11. SERVICE ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

California Attorney General so that the Attorney General may review this Consent Judgment prior to its submittal to the Court for approval. No sooner than forty five (45) days after the Attorney General has received the aforementioned copy of this Consent Judgment, and in the absence of any written objection by the Attorney General to the terms of this Consent Judgment, the parties may then submit it to the Court for approval.

12.1 Except as specifically provided in Section 4, each Party shall bear its own costs and attorney fees in connection with this action.

### 13. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

of the parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any party hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the parties.

This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding

## 14. GOVERNING LAW

- 14.1 The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California, without reference to any conflicts of law provisions of California law.
- 14.2 The Parties, including their counsel, have participated in the preparation of this Consent Judgment and this Consent Judgment is the result of the joint efforts of the Parties. This Consent Judgment was subject to revision and modification by the Parties and has been accepted and approved as to its final form by all Parties and their counsel. Accordingly, any uncertainty or ambiguity existing in this Consent Judgment shall not be interpreted against any Party as a result of the manner of the preparation of this Consent Judgment. Each Party to this Consent Judgment agrees that any statute or rule of construction providing that ambiguities are to be resolved against the drafting Party should not be employed in the interpretation of this Consent Judgment and, in this regard, the Parties hereby waive California Civil Code § 1654.

#### 15. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS

15.1 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means of facsimile or portable document format (pdf), which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.

16.	NOTICES	
	16.1 Any notices under this Consent Judgment shall be by personal delivery or	r Fi
Class	Mail.	
	If to CAG:	
	Reuben Yeroushalmi, Esq. 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 240W	
	Beverly Hills, CA 90212	
•	(310) 623-1926	
	If to THOMAS & BETTS CORPORATION or THOMAS & BETTS	
•	INTERNATIONAL, INC:	
	Thomas & Betts Corporation 8155 T&B Blvd.	
: .	Memphis, TN 38125	
	With a copy to:	
	John Verber, Esq.	
	Burnham Brown	
	P.O. Box 119	
	Oakland, CA 94604	
	Phone: 510.444.6800	
	Fax: 510.835.6666	
	If to TRUE VALUE COMPANY:	
t		
	True Value Company	٠
	8600 West Bryn Mawr Avenue	
. <b>*</b> :	Chicago, IL 60631	
	With a copy to:	•
	John Verber, Esq.	
	Burnham Brown P.O. Box 119	
	Oakland, CA 94604	
ľ	Phone: 510.444.6800	
	Fax: 510.835.6666	
1		

.28

of the party he or she represents to eater in If the party represented and legally to bind!		
WORDED TO:	AGREED TO:	
Date: 2-24-/4, 2014	Date:	, 2014
		· · · ·
w. ASS	By:	,
FOR PLANDLISE, CONSUMER ADVOCACY SECUP, INC.	For Defendants, THO CORPORATION and INTERNATIONAL, I	THOMAS & BETT
	AGREED TO:	
	Date:	, 2014
		A
	Вў:	<del>                                      </del>
	For Defendant, TRUE	VALUE COMPAN
IT IS SO ORDENED.		
Cinto		
Date:	JUDGE OF THE SUPER	IOR COUDT
	WINE OF THE BUTCH	gernergery. The Super Su

CONSENT JUDGMENT [PROPOSED]

28